THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

HARDIN CRAIG

VOL. XXII APRIL, 1947 NO. 2

CONTENTS

PAGE

Accidental Judgments, Casual Slaughters and Purposes Mistook: Critical Reactions to Shakspere's *Henry the Fifth*.....*Paul A. Jorgensen* 51

Notes on Shakspere & *The Mirror of Knighthood* (Concluded) *Dorothy R. Evans* 62

Mr. Wilson's *Henry IV*, Parts I and II.....*R. W. Babcock* 69

"The Foot of Motion".....*Ruth L. Anderson* 81

Some Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Satire Against Money Lenders (Concluded) .....*Burton A. Milligan* 84

French Translations on A Passage in *Love's Labour's Lost*.....*John Phelps* 94

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, $2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1947, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

ACCIDENTAL JUDGMENTS, CASUAL SLAUGHTERS, AND PURPOSES MISTOOK: CRITICAL REACTIONS TO SHAKSPERE'S *HENRY THE FIFTH*

By PAUL A. JORGENSEN

IN ONE of the calmest remarks ever made upon Shakspere's *Henry V,* A. H. Tolman affirms: "I believe that Shakespeare is irritated by the smallness and the inadequate equipment of the stage in presenting his 'Henry V' because he wishes to idealize and glorify his hero."[1] Holinshed, like Shakspere, had felt the difficulty of doing justice to Henry V's greatness. Speaking of certain of that monarch's virtues, he confesses: "Were it not that by his acts they did plainlie appeare, hard were it by words to make them credible."[2] Although Shakspere was trammeled in depicting dramtic action, he did not have Holinshed's trouble with words. And probably on behalf of no other character has he used words so lavishly and so eagerly in praise.

A large part of the first scene of *Henry V* is devoted to eulogies by two churchmen, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Ely. The prelates ascribe to Henry every virtue and faculty of the complete monarch — "the mirror of all Christian kings," as he is later called. Suggesting Shakspere's anxiety to proclaim fully the greatness of his hero is the dramatic prematureness of this panegyric, as well as other passages of praise; exposition outdistances the action. Not only the churchmen, but representatives of almost all human types appearing in the play praise the king. Gower, typical of the king's captains, exclaimss (upon not too worthy a basis), "O, 'tis a gallant king!" (IV, vii, II).[3] Pistol, most eloquent representative of the least reputable element in the army, speaks words of praise for Henry to the disguised king himself; he calls him "a heart of gold" and exclaims that he loves the "lovely bully" (IV, i, 44-8). Even the French opposition, who have little reason either to like or to respect Henry, are utilized by Shak-

spere in the general chorus of acclamation. The Constable of France, most rational of the French nobility, insists to his fellows upon Henry's majestiy, his modesty, his resolution, his discretion, and his complete reformation (II, iv, 32). The French king proclaims his fears of the English monarch before Henry has given him sufficient cause for anxiety:

> let us fear
> The native mightiness and fate of him.
> (II, iv, 63-4)

Such unanimous and uncoerced assent toward a character's magnificence is virtually unique in the Shaksperian drama.

The playwright's attempt to glorify Henry V is especially interesting in the light of its results. *Henry V* is one of the very few plays wherein Shakspere clearly commits himself by stating his dramatic purpose and by constantly labeling his protagonist. Exposition of the sort we long for vainly in *Hamlet* is here needlessly abundant. It will therefore be possible to inquire how well Shakspere's intentions were realized. My particular business in this paper will be to study critical reaction to the character of Henry and to evaluate it in view of Shakspere's intentions.

Among the writings of early critics very few "character studies" of Henry are to be found. A few of the best critics virtually passed the play, as well as its hero, by. Doctor Johnson, except for the scene telling of Falstaff's death, found worthy of sustained comment only the courtship episode, and this he condemned as vulgar and inappropriate to the character of the king. Coleridge, perhaps because he found nothing of himself in the role, had little of significance to say of Henry V. Carlyle, on the other hand, may have seen his own strenuous ideals attractively embodied in the monarch, for he gives the play and its hero unusual prominence in his essay on Shakspere as the poet-hero. He finds a "noble Patriotism" in the play, "far other than the 'indifference' you sometimes hear ascribed to Shakespeare."[4]

Of the sustained evaluations of Henry V's character,

Hazlitt's is the most famous, not only because of its vivacity but because of the brilliance of its abuse. Most of Hazlitt's dislike for Henry may be accounted for by the critic's democratic principles; for, after a long introductory paragraph of sarcasm and invective against war and autocracy, Hazlitt amicably announces, "So much for the politics of this play; now for the poetry,"[5] and enters happily upon an appreciation. This portion of the essay is concentrated upon the play's "beauties," but a few kind words are included for Henry personally:

> The behaviour of the king, in the difficult and doubtful circumstances in which he is placed, is as patient and modest as it is spirited and lofty in his prosperous fortune[6]

Though Hazlitt's witty strictures upon Henry's militancy and ferocity are unusually telling, Hazlitt is certainly not what he is sometimes said to be, the unkindest of commentators upon Shakspere's hero king.[7]

Mr. John Palmer is a modern critic who, like Hazlitt, is interested in Henry's political nature. He devotes some of his finest irony to what is virtually a present-day exposé of Henry V as hypocrite and shady politician. Mr. Palmer makes devastating use of the discovery that Henry, having given his ultimatum to France before conferring with the prelates of the Church, actually "was not seeking spiritual or legal advice on a step to be taken; he was inviting moral approbation for a *fait accompli.*"[8] Mr. Palmer's comment is noteworthy in that only an unusually careful reader of the play would be likely to discover this discrepancy; and even should he discover it, he would be apt to ignore it in the air of manifest sincerity pervading the scene. Mr. Palmer's wit is pre-eminently effective in his commentary upon one of the most solemn of Henry's speeches in *2 Henry IV*. The prince, holding the crown of his supposedly dead father, speaks the beautiful lines, "O polish'd perturbation! golden care. . . ." According to Mr. Palmer, "he studies here the attitude of public persons in all times and places who, in assuming power, profess to be taking up a burden which they would gladly avoid and sigh without sincerity for the treasure of the humble."[9] Mr. Palmer

thoroughly enjoys the courtship scene at the end of *Henry V*, but for a reason that Shakspere could scarcely have intended. The critic sees in Henry's wooing of Katherine "just those characteristics which are most admired in the legendary Englishman": an ability to jest good-humoredly with one's enemy—when the enemy is beaten, and the generosity of offering "a sound heart to a fair lady—when her dowry is assured."[10] Such applause surely would not have been welcomed by Shakspere, who was intent upon depicting "the mirror of all Chrisian kings."

Mr. Palmer and, to a less extent, Hazlitt are representative of a small group of critics who gratefully find Shakspere's Henry V not witty in himself, but the cause that wit is in other men.

In another group of critics, strong resentment and anger toward Henry are mainly evident. If these critics are witty, their real aim is not to amuse. Mr. Bernard Shaw, who might not be unwilling to serve as spokesman for the group, is distressed to find in Shakspere's hero a dramatic embodiment of that which he has devoted his life to rebuking. "The combination," he writes of Henry, "of conventional propriety and brute masterfulness in his public capacity with a low-lived blackguardism in his private tastes is not a pleasant one." Henry, to him, typifies "an able young Philistine inheriting high position and authority, which he holds on to and goes through with by keeping a tight grip on his conventional and legal advantages, but who would have been quite in his place if he had been born a gamekeeper or a farmer. . . ."[11] W. B. Yeats is likewise alienated by Henry's "gross vices" and "coarse nerves," and he suspects Shakspere of having made this monarch a vessel of clay to counterbalance Richard II, his vessel of porcelain.[12] Frank Harris is another who denounces Shakspere's royal hero for his barbarism, his lack of sensitivity, and his manliness. Henry, according to Harris, "shows as in a glass Shakespeare's poverty of conception when he is dealing with the distinctively manly qualities."[13] His feeling against the king reaches actual resentment and exclamatory force: "The puppet is not even human: mere wood!"[14] But much of Harris's ill-will arises from the demands of his thesis:

The Man Shakespeare is a sustained plea for us to read Shakspere's sensitive, feminine soul into his greatest human creations. Henry V is a personage singularly inaccessible to the thesis.

Most denunciatory of this group of frankly hostile critics is John Masefield. Like most of the others, he accuses Henry of masculinity, emotional and intellectual insensitivity, and, in general, a personality unlike that of Hamlet. To these, he adds the significant charge of "success and worldly happiness,"[15] an accusation, to judge from similar reactions of other critics, more serious than those of militancy, gross vices, and aristocracy.[16] To Masefield may also be credited perhaps the least relevant stricture ever made against the character of Henry: "When he learns that his behaviour may have lost him the crown, he passes a sponge over his past and fights like a wildcat for the right of not having to work for a living."[17]

We turn now to the most interesting and troublesome of the commentaries. Dowden is one of the earliest and foremost of a group of critics whose utterances upon the character of Shakspere's Henry V suggest a divided, basically unstable attitude. His eulogies of the king are justly famous and vie with Shakspere's own in their lyricism. "Through his union with the vital strength of the world," he writes of Henry, "he becomes one of the world's most glorious and beneficent forces."[18] Possibly Shakspere, who pictured crouching at Henry's heels the unamiable train of "famine, sword, and fire," would not have identified his hero in Dowden's encomium. But he would have recognized an enthusiasm kindred to his own in it, as well as in the phrases, "his heroic greatness" and "the light of splendid achievement in his eyes."[19]

The real difficulty arising from Dowden's comments is in reconciling the ardent appreciation of such passages with conclusions that are coolly restrained. Consider the dampening effect of the word *practical* and of the phrase *will not fail* in the following sentences:

> But it is clear and unquestionable that King Henry V is

> Shakespeare's ideal of the *practical* heroic character. He is the king who will not fail. He will not fail as the saintly Henry VI failed, nor as Richard II failed, a hectic, self-indulgent nature, a mockery king of pageantry and sentiment and rhetoric . . .[20]

In spite of the general inclination toward praise in this passage, Dowden clearly does not like a *"practical* heroic characetr; nor does he hold as his own ideal a hero "who will not fail." What is more, he does not wish such a character to be Shakspere's ideal:

> But is this practical, positive, efficient character, with his soldier-like piety and his jolly fashion of wooing, is this the highest ideal of our supreme poet?[21]

The epithets *practical, positive, efficient, soldier-like,* and *jolly* — inherently not abusive — here take on the force almost of "snarl words."

In R. G. Moulton the split in vision is so subtle as to be scarcely noticeable. Unlike Dowden, he can contrast Henry with a less "practical," "efficient," and "successful" personage with inferences prejudicial to the patriot king. Comparing character-development in *Macbeth* with that in *Henry V,* Moulton is strangely successful in concealing personal preferences. If the reader of Moulton's remarks concludes that Macbeth is the more interesting and likable person because he develops throughout the play and is responsive to painful instruction from life, the reader rather than Moulton is responsible. Unfortunately, however, Moulton could not forbear the luxury of one sentence bright with irony. Speaking of the traitors Cambridge, Scroop, and Grey, he observes that they "have grace enough to long for their death; and Henry, who has no weakness, not even the weakness of mercy, dismisses them to their fate."[22] A striking, though brief observation, the sentence vitiates the carefully achieved detachment of the total analysis. The momentary glimpse of Moulton's personal dislike is sufficient. Perhaps he himself did not fully acknowledge the attitude, yet the severity of the sentence indicates his resentment — already noticed in other critics — toward Henry's efficiency, his impenetrable armor.

A. C. Bradley presents another arresting example of

the critical difficulty under consideration. A judicious and imaginative interpreter of Shakspere's great tragic heroes and of Coriolanus, Bradley fails to achieve his habitual steadiness of vision when he views Henry V. He writes in his famous essay on Falstaff:

> Shakespeare has made Henry, on the whole, a fine and very attractive character . . .
>
> Both as prince and as king he is deservedly a favourite, and particularly so with English readers, being, as he is, perhaps the most distinctively English of all Shakespeare's men.[23]

A peculiarly fervent denunciation follows, virtually splitting the essay in two. Bradley will not allow even the modest truth of Dowden's contention that, as Bradley phrases it, Henry is Shakspere's "ideal man of action." "The poet," he insists,

> who drew Hamlet and Othello can never have thought that even the ideal man of action would lack that light upon the brow which at once transfigures them and marks their doom . . . Even poor Timon, the most inefficient of the tragic heroes, has something in him that Henry never shows. Nor is it merely that his nature is limited: if we follow Shakespeare and look closely at Henry, we shall discover with the many fine traits a few less pleasing.

These "less pleasing" traits unluckily happen to be quite sufficient to alienate one's sympathies: Henry is his father's son, and has "a readiness to use other people as a means to his own ends"; furthermore, "there is no sign in him of a strong affection for any one. . . ."[24] The bases for Bradley's antipathy for Henry are easily visible in the foregoing strictures, and readers of *Shakespearean Tragedy* will instantly recognize their seriousness.

Like Dowden and Bradley, J. W. Cunliffe fails to view Henry V calmly and impersonally. The concluding sentence to Cunliffe's study of Shakspere's hero-king is an encomium and suggests a strong conclusion to a eulogistic address: "It is his common humanity that endears him to us, his plain-speaking, his good-humor, and his practical common-sense."[25] Indeed, this eloquent tribute represents the conclusion toward which Cunliffe had wished to move and at which, apparently, he thought he had properly

arrived. An attentive reader of the essay, however, does not arrive with him. The reader has been waylaid by compelling stray remarks in Cunliffe's exposition. For example:

> It must be confessed that to a modern taste Henry's sallies of wit, whether as prince or king, are not of the most refined sort. He has a love for that most detestable kind of joke called practical; and his wooing of Katherine, though full of humor and a certain bluff overbearing hilarity, has nothing princely about it.[26]

That the reluctance of this "confession" is only specious is indicated by the severity of the vocabulary and the eagerness of the rebuke. A "modern taste" is evidently Cunliffe's own. Further, the "common humanity" and "modesty" of the concluding tribute merely call to mind an earlier and more fervent interpretation:

> With his boon companions Henry never forgets that he is a prince, and he does not let his companions forget it for long . . . Even in his most expansive moments there is a touch of condescension. We might like him better if he were more genuinely openhearted, but Shakespeare has not so represented him.[27]

"Practical common-sense" recalls the following:

> He is not troubled, any more than a modern capitalist on the eve of a great undertaking, with moral misgivings; he accepts the law as it is expounded by traditional authorities, all the more readily, no doubt, because it falls in with his own inclinations and interests.[28]

It would seem that Cunliffe had an irrepressible, though perhaps only dimly recognized, dislike for the man whom he formally extolls in the concluding sentence of his essay; and this dislike, restricted in expression to comments slanting from the main discourse, is more evident than his deliberate praise.

It would be possible to list other examples of imperfect sympathies for Shakspere's Henry V, most of which have led to subtly incoherent criticism. The instances cited in this paper are unusual in that they are probably the most interestingly expressed and because they are the work of eminent writers.

G. L. Kittredge's introduction to *Henry V* is note-

worthy in another respect. The late Harvard scholar cannily ignored in this case all problems involving emotion and consequently said very little about character interpretation. Those judgments concerning the personality of Henry which he permitted himself may well represent the maximum possible for any critic who wishes to avoid the embarrassment of bringing himself into the picture.

Among the conclusions suggested by this survey, the most obvious is that a significant difference exists between Shakspere's professed intentions and the reactions of many estimable critics. The hero whom he studiously attempted to "idealize and glorify"[29] has been ridiculed, hated, or imperfectly liked by many critics. To all appearances Shakspere souht to depict him as pious, idealistic, learned, thoughtful, sensitive to the opinion of his subjects, and endowed with a common humanity. His critics are repelled by his "gross vices," his snobbery, his efficiency and successfulness, his imperviousness to thought and emotion — in general ,his worldliness.

It is doubtful whether this sharp hiatus between artistic purpose and response — singularly unusual for Shakspere — can be explained by the difference in temperament between the people of Shakspere's era and those of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The growth of democracy might make us less idolatrous toward God's anointed ruler, and the trend toward pacifism might dampen our enthusiasm for any war of aggression. But Shakspere makes Henry as sensitive as any modern to the realistic nature of warfare; and in giving majesty to his hero, the poet does not in this case depend so heavily upon birth as he had done in *Richard II*, for the virtues attributed to Henry should have exalted him even had he been of the commonalty. Furthermore, if we insist upon a changed attitude toward democracy and warfare, how shall we explain the fact that Coriolanus, most autocratic and militant of Shakspere's heroes, has suffered only a fraction of Henry's infamy?

The popular success of Lawrence Olivier's recent film version of *Henry V* and the admiration accorded the personality of its hero suggest that dislike for the king might be almost confined to poets, scholars, and other intellectuals

who have not witnessed or conceived the play as a dynamic spectacle. Furthermore, the popular audiences of today, particularly in America, are not, like intellectuals, alienated by low-comedy courtship scenes, practical jokes, successful business men, and happy endings.

Notwithstanding, the judicious have been grieved, resentful, and bewildered; a few have been led to irrelevant cleverness rather than to the accurate interpretation which is their wont: possibly not all the fault should be laid upon the critic. Shakspere's was the self-imposed task, in a sense, of justifying a god to man. Specifically he tried to justify a radiant, triumphant, transfigured hero in terms comprehensible to his unregenerate fellows. Those unregenerate souls included not only the soldiers Bates and Williams, but the ghosts of Falstaff and Hotspur. The task was manifestly impossible. Just as Milton was to make his anti-perfectionist elements too grandly human, so Shakspere instinctively had made his unregenerate men compellingly real. Shakspere's allegiance, therefore, may well have been as sharply divided as that of some of his critics. Consciously, as the choral proclamations testify, he sought to glorify Henry. But the artist in him may have failed to comply, offering panegyric instead of the reality. Even the poetry formally eulogizing the king is, as Mr. Mark Van Doren has noted in his brilliant strictures, apt to be labored.[30]

Doctor Johnson observed that "not even *Shakespeare* can write well without a proper subject."[31] May not the critics be forgiven if they have failed to interpret satisfactorily a hero whom his dramatic creator sketched with uncertain hand?

University of California at Davis
Davis, Cal.

[1] "The Epic Character of 'Henry V.' In *Falstaff and Other Shakespearean Topics* (N. Y., 1925), p. 55.
[2] *Holinshed's Chronicles As Used in Shakespeare's Plays,* ed. A. Nicoll (London, 1927), p. 89.
[3] All Shakspere references are to the *Complete Works,* ed. G. L. Kittredge (N. Y., 1936).

[4] Thomas Carlyle, *On Heroes, Hero Worship and the Heroic in History* (London, 1935), p. 144.

[5] William Hazlitt, *Characters of Shakespear's Plays* (London, 1906), p. 158.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 164.

[7] Mr. John Hobart, to take a very recent example, is convinced that Hazlitt "positively hated Henry V," San Francisco *Chronicle: This World,* "Drama," November 17, 1946.

[8] John Palmer, *Political Characters of Shakespeare* (London, 1945), p. 224.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 215.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 245.

[11] G. Bernard Shaw, *Dramatic Opinions* (London, 1906), vol. i, p. 426.

[12] W. B. Yeats, *Ideas of Good and Evil* (London, 1903), 155ff.

[13] Frank Harris, *The Man Shakespeare* (London, 1909), p. 92.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 106.

[15] John Masefield, *William Shakespeare* (N. Y., 1911), 11 ff.

[16] M. C. Ridley, for example, joins with a "limited spiritual range" "unmitigatedly efficient and successful in practical achievement," as though the two were closely akin and equally serious. *Shakespeare's Plays* (N. Y., 1938), pp. 112-13.

[17] *Op. cit.* 111 ff.

[18] Edward Dowden, *Shakspere, a Critical Study of His Mind and Art* (N. Y., 1918), p. 192.

[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 190 and 195.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 66.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 66.

[22] R. G. Moulton, "On Character-Development in Shakspere As Illustrated by Macbeth and Henry V." *Transactions New Shakespeare Society,* xxv (1880-86), p. 567.

[23] A. C. Bradley, "The Rejection of Falstaff," *Oxford Lectures on Poetry* (London, 1909), pp. 255-6.

[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 257-8.

[25] J. W. Cunliffe, "Character of Henry V As Prince and King," *Shaksperian Studies by Members of the Department of English and Comparative Literature in Columbia University* (N. Y., 1919), p. 331.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 325.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 326.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 328.

[29] A. H. Tolman, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

[30] Mark Van Doren, *Shakespeare* (N. Y., 1939). Mr. Van Doren does not limit this criticism to poetry devoted to the praise of Henry.

[31] Samuel Johnson, Notes on *Henry V.* In *Johnson on Shakespeare,* ed. Walter Raleigh (London, 1908), p. 133.

NOTES ON SHAKSPERE & *THE MIRROR OF KNIGHTHOOD*

(*Concluded*)

By DOROTHY R. EVANS

The Tempest

Perott[21] has also listed what he considered *the Tempest's* borrowings from the *Mirror.* To me, as to Mr. Thomas,[22] most of these so-called borrowings have little significance, many being commonplaces of romance (storms accompanying magic charms, noises,[23] magic boats, bowers, etc.). Others, notably the forced marriage, also seem farfetched. Thomas, speaking of Perott's idea that *The Tempest* draws this marriage theme from the story of Polidarco,[24] says it is not a very convincing original for Shakspere's play. I thoroughly agree. Thomas suggests rather the story of Palisteo[25] and the adventure on Artimaga's Island as a more probable source, but he does not press the suggestion.[26] Perott[27] had drawn up a table of equivalents in which Prospero is Palisteo, Ferdinand is Trebatio, and Miranda is Lindaraza. Since Thomas has summarized this *Mirror* episode, I shall not repeat it here.[28]

In *The Tempest,* Miranda is Prospero's only child. He, a magician, had turned over to his brother the management of the state (I,ii,66 ff.). Palisteo, living on an island (but very gorgeously equipped) with his son Flamides and his daughter Lindaraza, somewhat resembles Prospero.

> "Palisteo being the second son of ye king of Phrygia, my father not being borne to the kingdome fell rather to seke his owne delight without envy, then to trouble himself with the care of gouerning. Aboue all he studied the Arte Magicke, where by his paines at length came to the most absolute perfection of all in Asia . . .[29] [He] louing to be solitarie came & dwelled in this Iland, bringing wt him my sister & those waiting women which you haue seene, . . ."

Palisteo is dead when the *Mirror* episode occurs, but by his enchantments he has brought about the *affaire* between

his daughter and the Emperor. Palisteo hardly seems to correspond to Prospero, after all. Nor does Lyrgandeo,[30] a great magician and an island-dweller (who has no daughter), nor does Artemidoro,[31] who is an island-dweller and has a daughter, but is not an abdicated ruler nor brother to a king. However, Artemidoro's daughter, Calinda, is a sort of Miranda-Ariel combination. Really, none of the *Mirror*'s chief magicians seems to be Prospero.

ii

Shakspere set his scene (I, i, ii, stage directions) on "an uninhabited island" whose only dwelling seems to be Prospero's "cell" (I, ii). Obviously this setting can not be indebted to descriptions of Artemidoro's or Lindaraza's palatial island homes. But it does resemble, as Thomas suggested, Artimaga's Island.[32] The possible debt to Ariosto in the descriptions of this island, I have discussed.[33] If, as has been suggested, Shakspere had in mind the storm and island of Ruggiero's shipwreck (*O.F.* XLI),[34] we are now concerned with *The Tempest*'s debt to Ariosto direct and to Ariosto as presented in the *Mirror* passages borrowed from *Orlando Furioso*. Let us try to isolate resemblances between the play and the *Mirror*.

> Though this island seem to be desert, . . .
> Uninhabitable and almost inaccessible . . .
> Yet, ...
> It must needs be of subtle, tender and delicate temperance.
> . . . . . .
> The air breathes upon us here most sweetly,
> . . . . . .
> Here is everything advantageous to life.
> . . . . . .
> How lush and lusty the grass looks! How Green. (II,i,39-55)

When Claridiana, seeking the Knight of the Sun, lands (by choice) upon Artimaga's island, she observes

> the country so plaine and no habitation . . . but as an unpeopled and desert place; . . . the Iland was very fresh & greene, and full of trees, . . . [The Knight of the Sun lived there] eating . . . wilde fruites, . . . such hearbes and fruites, as were in the Iland, . . .[35]

iii

Caliban, son of the witch Sycorax, born on the island (I, ii, 280-85) owned the island (*ibid.*, 390), having inherited it from his mother. So Fauno, son of the devil and Artimaga, a vicious and revolting woman,[36] was born on the island and owns it by maternal inheritance. With I, ii, 315-18

> Then was this island . . .
> Save for the son that she did litter here,
> A freckl'd whelp, hag-born—not honour'd with a human shape.

compare this from the *Mirror*[37]

> [Fauno went throughout] the Iland, & did so much harme, that he left none aliue where he became, some slaine, and other some hearing the report of his crueltie, fled awaie, so ye the Iland is lefte desolate, and no inhabitants therin, neither anie other liuing thing.

Caliban's parentage

> Thou poisonous slave, got by the devil himself
> Upon thy wicked dam[38]

resembles Fauno's. The devil explained to Artimaga that he would come to her in the form of a strange and fearful beast,[39] from Mt. Atlas. The offspring of this union was Fauno.

As to the appearance of Caliban and Fauno, there is no specific resemblance. Caliban is fish-like; Fauno resembles a unicorn, among other creatures, and he has a horn in his forehead.[40] The descriptions of him are too long to quote here, but one detail must be mentioned. Fauno carries in his belly devils in the form of armed men whom he emits from his mouth,[41] to help him fight. Possibly there is an allusion to Fauno in Trinculo's crawling (II, ii) in under Caliban's gaberdine. Stephano, talking to Caliban, discovers that the monster has two voices (one later proves to have been Trinculo).

> *Stephano*: Four legs and two voices: a most delicate monster! . . Doth thy other mouth call me? . . This is a devil, and no monster. I will leave him; . . .

> *Trinculo*: Stephano . . . touch and speak to me; for I am Trinculo—be not afeard . . .
>
> *Stephano*: If thou beest Trinculo, come forth. I'll pull thee by the lesser legs. If any be Trinculo's legs, these are they. Thou art very Trinculo indeed! How cam'st thou to be the siege of this moon-calf? Can he vent Trinculos? (II,ii,96-114)

iv

Prospero calls his dwelling a "cell." The *Mirror* describes the Knight of the Sun's "cottage of boughes."[42] Here again Ariosto is probably the ultimate source,[43] though the derivation may be through the *Mirror.*

v

Joseph Hunter long ago suggested[44] that Prospero's island might be Lampedusa instead of some remoter one like Bermuda. It is perhaps useless to speculate any further, for Shakspere certainly may have invented the island scene. But, assuming that the *Mirror* is following Ariosto,[45] cantos XLI, XLV, XLVI, here, it is interesting to remark upon certain details in the description of the island which seem to agree with the legends regarding Lampedusa.

The sailors tell the Knight of the Sun[46] that

> this Iland is . . . so fearefull unto all sailors that pesseth this waie, . . . and that fire which you doe see, with the thicke smoake that ascendeth into the aire, is all that which proceedeth out of the terrible and horrible mouth of that diuellish Fauno, for that it is full of infernall diuells.

Lampedusa, it will be recalled, was thought by Mediterranean sailors[47] to emit St. Elmo's fire, and this legend may be reflected in another *Mirror* statement,[48]

> an Iland, and out of the middest thereof they might perceiue great flames and sparkes of fire, with a terrible darke and thicke smoake.

Another quality of Lampedusa was the hard rock;[49] there were also loud noises,[50] strange in an uninhabited place. All of these items are as much a part of *The Tempest* as of the *Mirror,* where more is made of them than in Ariosto. Still it seems scarcely justifiable to say of *The Tempest* that it definitely owes anything to the *Mirror.* There are

certainly provocative resemblances between the two stories and it is quite possible that Shakspere was drawing on the romance. Much of the resemblance may be romance commonplace, much of it can be coincidental. But perhaps—slight as it is—the query "Can he vent Trinculos" is our best reason for thinking that Shakspere might have had the *Mirror* in mind as he wrote *The Tempest.*

C.

Cymbeline

The *Mirror* has also been mentioned in relation to *Cymbeline*[51] and perhaps it should be added to the list of analogues of *Cymbeline* for the cave scene. There are in the pastoral 1583 volume of the *Mirror*[52] two scenes which are worth noting in this connection. The first[53] is the scene which Richard Johnson borrowed nearly verbatim from the *Mirror* and incorporated into his *Seven Champions of Christendom.*[54] It tells how Claridiano and Printo sleep on the ground at night, but actually spending the night walking up and down. They are famished when Claridiano, luckily, sees a mountain from which smoke issues. Arrived at the mountain, he finds a cave; he slays the giant keeper just as the rest of his party arrive. They enter and find the giant's venison roasting. Each person takes a special task ("the Ladyes made the fire") in preparing the food. They dine on half-cooked meat, bread and beer, and then, fearing lest another giant appear, they "tooke the waie and trauailed through a narowe path which seemed to be vsed by the Gyant, . . ." (Cf. *Cymbeline,* III, vi, 18)

The second episode[55] tells how Trebatio, Bramidoro, and Victorando, lost in a forest, come upon a mountain in which is a great cave. They enter and find it filled with quarters of venison and other game. They look outside but find no one (Cf. *Cymbeline,* III, vi, 23). Bramidoro says he is hungry and Trebatio says, "Let me haue my bodie and stomacke satisfied. . . & afterward at the paying of ye reckoning they shall see what money I haue, . . ." (Cf. *Cymbeline,* III, vi, 50). They roast half a deer and eat it outdoors, always with a care "to see if their host did come."

There is much talk of the reckoning which probably "must be paid with fists." Then two giants come to the cave, and when they find "the lacke of their flesh" (Cf. *Cymbeline,* III, vi, 41), they come out "to demaund of vs the reckoning & to pay ye shot." It is paid in combat, and the knights go their way carrying food with them.

These are not close parallels, but there are some resemblances to the *Cymbeline* episode.

Hamlet

Perott has said[56] that the *Mirror* reminded him of *Hamlet,* IV, vii, 175-6,

> Her clothes spread wide;
> And mermaid-like, awhile they bore her up:

He cites the *Mirror* tale in which a woman jumped into the sea, "but being clad in large garments she coulde not drowne presently."[57] She does drown—slowly. Perott might also have mentioned the *Mirror* lady who "ranne & lept into the water with full intent to drowne hir selfe, the which she had done, had not hir clothes borne hir vp, . . . "[58] I see here no debt on Shakspere's part other than that to every day life.

Mills College

---

[21]"The Probable Source of the Plot of Shakespeare's *Tempest," loc. cit.;* "Beaumont and Fletcher and the *Mirror of Knighthood," loc. cit.; "The Mirrour of Knighthood," Romanic Review* IV (400-01; "Die Magelonen und die Sturmfabel." *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft* XLVII (1911), 128-31; *Culture Española* XII (1908-9), 1923-29.

[22]*Spanish and Portuguese Romances.* 280 ff.

[23]*Tempest,* I, ii, 275-96 draws on *Mirror,* Pt. 2 (1699 ed.), 94: "giueth terrible shrikes," etc. *Tempest* III, ii, 144-52 draws on Pt. 2, 96.

[24]1578, 148 ff.

[25]*Ibid.,* 14, 16, 148 ff.

[26]*Spanish and Portuguese Romances.* 281-83.

[27]"Die Magelonen-und die Sturmfabel," *loc. cit.,* 128.

[28]*Op. cit.,* 278-80; cf. Thomas, "Shakespeare y España" in *Homenaje a Menéndez Pidal,* I, 225; Matulka, *op. cit.,* 237.

[29]1578, 148.

[30]*Ibid.,* 41v; *cf.* also 57.

[31]*Ibid.,* 79v-80-87.

[32]1586[?]. 59, 69v, 70, chs. 14-5, 28-30.

[33]*"The Mirror of Knighthood* and the *Orlando Furioso,"* forthcoming, *PMLA.*

[34]Joseph Hunter. *New Illustrations of the Life, Studies, and Writings of Shakespeare.* (London, 1845), I, 161ff. *cf. Variorum, The Tempest,* 1 ff.

[35]1586[?], 127, *cf. ibid.,* 61-61v, 77v, 137v.
[36]*Ibid.,* 59v-61.
[37]*Ibid.,* 61-61v.
[38]I, ii, 319-20.
[39]1586[?]. 59v-61.
[40]*Ibid.,* 60-61v; 73v-76.
[41]*Ibid.,* 73v. 76.
[42]*Ibid.,* 77v.
[43]*Variorum Tempest,* p. 2.
[44]*Variorum Tempest,* p. 1 ff.
[45]1586[?]. chs. 14-5, 28-30.
[46]*Ibid.,* 61v; *cf.* 59v, 73v, 70, 74.
[47]*Variorum Tempest,* pp. 1-2.
[48]1586[?]. 58.
[49]*Ibid.,* 72v-73, 77; *Tempest,* II, ii, 180 and I, ii, 423-24.
[50]*Ibid.,* 70, 73v, 74; *Tempest,* III, ii, 143 ff.
[51]Thomas, *Shakespeare and Spain,* 30, rejects Perott's arguments. The present discussion lies outside the Thomas-Perott suggestions.
[52]Edwin Greenlaw. "Shakespeare's Pastorals." *SP* XIII (1916), 122-54.
[53]Pp. 220-223.
[54]I shall discuss Johnson's use of the *Mirror* elsewhere.
[55]Pp. 261-262.
[56]The Probable Source of the Plot of Shakespeare's *Tempest," loc. cit.;* "Ueber die Entlehnungen and Anderungen von Namen in den Schauspielen und Erzählungen mit Verkleidungsmotiv." *Shakespeare Jahrbuch,* XLIII (1907), 218.
[57]1578, [136].
[58]*Ibid.,* 27.

MR. WILSON'S *HENRY IV*, PARTS I AND II

By R. W. Babcock

MR. J. DOVER WILSON, in his new *Henry IV* texts, has turned somewhat conservative and distinctly deferential. Not till the very end of *Henry IV, Part II,* in a note on the Epilogue, is there a spark of the old spectacular Wilson, of *MAAN, MND, AYLI,* and *TN,* and though some of us may welcome this picture of the 'Editor Tamed,' I think it a bit sad to see such a spark grow dim.

Let us take the two plays separately, and in sequence, and see just what has happened.

The Introduction in *Henry IV,* Pt. I, covers both plays, which are dedicated to the "Memory of Q," Arthur Quiller-Gouch, Mr. Wilson's collaborator up to the *Hamlet* volume in 1934. And I should say right at the start that Mr. Wilson needs another 'Q,' for his literary introductions. They are not his forte.

This Introduction promises a third volume, in type at least, to supplement *The Fortunes of Falstaff* (1943), and the present textual volumes, which may be considered as one type. (In this procedure Mr. Wilson is following his *Hamlet* volumes.) The 'third' book, to come, will treat of the "sources and textual history of the double play and its sequel *Henry V*."[1]

Then the Editor immediately proceeds to offer arguments, reminiscent of *The Fortunes of Falstaff,* to prove the very close connection of the two parts. He suggests that the *Richard II-Henry V* tetralogy was originally three plays but that Shakspere split up *Henry IV*. I wonder what he would think now of Mr. Tillyard's idea that there is possibly a *lost* tetralogy[2] of these plays — a version which in Shakspere's work really preceded the other tetralogy, now dated first? (Mr. Wilson mentions Mr. Tillyard in his first footnote, but that's all.) At the end of this section of the Introduction the Editor recurs to his symbolism of *The Fortunes:* Part I is Chivalry; Part II is Rule of Law.

The next section turns to *Henry IV* (now considered as essentially one play) as "an Elizabethan history play"[3] —earlier he called it "a chronicle play."[4] Here he could well have profited by Mr. Tillyard's recen tbook (and in his subsequent notes too), but he does point out some of Mr. Tillyard's basic ideas: the divinity of Kingship—'Hal' at the end is "the true 'governor' "[5]—and the Elizabethan horror of usurpation and rebellion. The Introduction closes with a 1942 anecdote about the effectiveness of Falstaff. (Probably 'Q' could have done better than all this.)

The rest of the first volume contains an excellent stage history of both plays by the late Harold Child—into which I think has crept something of a new note (a note echoed later in both the text and the Notes), *i.e.* a section on the plays in *America* (pp. xliv ff.)!—followed by the full text of *Henry IV*, Part I, a note on "The Copy of *1 Henry IV*," the Notes, and, at the end, some "Parallels from Nashe" and the Glossary. Vol. II—*Henry IV*, Part II—contains just the text, a note on "The Copy for *2 Henry IV*," the Notes and the Glossary.

It is on the text mainly that I want to concentrate.

Several times in the Introduction and the Notes of *Henry IV*, Part I, Mr. Wilson has mentioned Mr. S. B. Hemingway,[6] American Editor of the Variorum *Henry IV*, Part I, in 1936. There are many other Americans mentioned too, but I shall concentrate on Mr. Hemingway at the moment. A rather rapid collation of Mr. Wilson's text with Mr. Heminway's (which also followed the Quarto text) reveals the rather astonishing fact that Mr. Wilson's text differs from Mr. Heminway's in only about 41 readings: 7 in Act I,[7] 9 in Act II,[8] 10 in Act III,[9] 8 in Act IV,[10] and 7 in Act V.[11] These differences include individual lining, words, speech headings, and prose-versus-verse. The spelling and punctuation I have not tabulated; in the case of the former Wilson modernizes persistently (*cf daub* for *dawbe*)[12] and in the case of the latter he not only modernizes[13] but has a system all his own,[14] which is immaterial. (The stage directions I shall return to presently.) What now impresses me about the above collation — which may

well err up to at least 100 differences—is the amazing similarity of the two texts in actual readings. Mr. Wilson and Mr. Hemingway have both been pretty consistent in sticking to the Quarto. This text of Mr. Wilson's, then, is *not a new text,* from the readings point of view, by a long shot. I do not say, of course, that he merely followed the Variorum; I simply point out that it is *not* a *new* text of *Henry IV,* Part I.

The stage directions, however, tell a totally different story; here Mr. Wilson *is new,* in more ways than one. May I list a few of the most prominent characteristics of Mr. Wilson's stage directions. (And here I must insist that my notes on this subject were gathered long before I saw Mr. Flatter's recent article in the *Bulletin,*[15] on Mr. Wilson's stage directions in *Richard II* and other texts.)

(1) All *exits* in the original copy are dropped—as old-fashioned, I suppose—in favor of a more direct statement, such as "Falstaff goes."[16]

(2) Similarly *Enters* are changed to something like "Worcester returns."[17]

(3) Directions are added generally for the movements of actors.[18]

(4) Gestures and facial expressions are often added.[19]

(5) Asides, or single parentheses for them, are inserted here and there.[20]

(6) A few scene settings are changed somewhat.[21]

(7) Mr. Wilson occasionally follows other editors' ideas (generally Capell's) in inserting a stage direction but uses his own words, and often adds more.[22]

(8) He uses single quotes for an original Quarto s.d. which he has reprinted.[23]

(9) But he uses some other editor's *exact words* for a stage direction without acknowledging them.[24]

(10) Finally, he often adds to a Quarto s.d. by inserting some new ideas of his own.[25]

All of this "business" certainly produces a decidedly different text from the Variorum text — a strictly new, Dover Wilson text. As to how far it is acceptable, I leave that to the individual reader. Mr. Flatter did not think it was legitimate editing.[26] I do not either, especially in the case of No. 9.

"The Copy for 1 *Henry IV*" was a simple little section of only six pages and deferred directly to Hemingway at the end.

The Notes I have not examined in much detail—*i.e.* for possible sources for them. Some of them have already been criticized in public print;[27] happily, very seldom now appears the old Wilson refrain, "hitherto overlooked,"[28] which vitiated his former texts. His historical notes tend to stress Holinshed without much reference to Hall,[29] a point wherein Mr. Tillyard might have helped him (as I suggested above), and most of the notes seem "glossarial," if I may use such a term. A few were of interpretive value.[30] I notice that he still sticks to Falstaff's wink;[31] and the comment on V, 1, 83—"both *our* armies," a Folio reading which the Editor adopts over his pet Q's "both *your* armies"—might have been referred to "your philosophy" in *Hamlet*,[32] where *your* is a purely rhetorical term and the accent falls on *philosophy*. The accent here should be on *both*.

Two further aspects of the Notes are extremely interesting. One involves the number of times Mr. Wilson now defers to other scholars—even Americans. Roughly speaking, the Notes mention by name some 40 Englishmen and 10 Americans (Kittredge 14 times[33]—and even Stoll once). The Introduction adds about 8 other Englishmen and 4 other Americans. Mr. Wilson is now quite aware of the work of other scholars.

I return to my own introduction. Mr. Wilson has be-

come distinctly deferential and somewhat conservative. The former point I have just now proved. The second one has been suggested by the text (except for the stage directions) and indicates where the spark of *MAAN, MND, AYLI,* and *TN* has gone dim. Here is a play with a character as popular as Benedick—more so. Could Mr. Wilson find *no* spot where the text was cut (in the poetry) to allow *more* of Falstaff to appear? No mixing of prose and verse that would imply revision? No strata of texts in this play? The answer is that in his Notes the Editor did definitely point out possible cuts,[34] short lines,[35] even textual strata,[36] and possible revision,[37] but—there is no speculation as to *what happened—why* it happened—what is *missing*. The old spectacular speculation of the four plays above is gone. I wonder why.

II

Henry IV, Part II

When we turn to the text of *Henry IV,* Part II, the situation is a bit different. It is apparently no longer possible to point out a distinct similarity between the Variorum text (edited by M. A. Shaaber) and Mr. Wilson's text because the former has gone back to the regular Variorum emphasis on the Folio, whereas Mr. Wilson is sticking to the Quarto as much as possible. He admits, however, that he has based the "punctuation of the prose on that of F for the most part"[38] and also that he deliberately followed the Folio text 55 times[39] and various editors (mostly 18th-century) ten times to solve the misprints in both Q and F.[40] The Folio is further needed, he notes, for the 8 cuts in the Q text.[41] All this so far is mainly from "The Copy for *2 Henry IV,*" and his dependence on other critics throughout this section is pronounced (Greg, Chambers, Shaaber, Maas, Gaw, Pollard, Schücking and Hart). He is pretty sure now, in spite of the evidence to the contrary, of Shakspere's hand in *Sir Thomas More,*[42] but the most interesting fact to me is that Mr. Shaaber is mentioned four times in these 9 pages. And in the subsequent notes this American editor is referred to 29 times![43] Not only, therefore, is there considerable connection between Mr. Shaaber's Variorum

text and Mr. Wilson's version (even though they use different originals as a basis), but Mr. Wilson's great deference to an American is astonishing and (together with the British names listed above) parallels his general deference to other scholars in the case of *Henry IV,* Part I, as noted above.

It is an interesting fact, moreover—to return to Mr. Shaaber—that if one eliminates certain basic differences between Q and F texts, the closeness of Mr. Wilson's text to Mr. Shaaber's is startling. "The decorous F"[44] in general (1) throws out God and other oaths, (2) uses *he* for Q *a* (Mr. Wilson likes the Cambridge *a'*), uses *if* for Q *and* (Mr. Wilson chooses *an* or *an't*). So, having eliminated these differences as merely basic, I found in a rapid collation of Mr. Wilson and Mr. Shaaber 18 differences in the Induction and Act I, 28 in Act II, 17 in Act III, 31 in Act IV, 27 in Act V and the Epilogue—a grand total of 121.[45] This includes word readings (F or Q or an editor's), emendations, lining and line omissions, but obviously does not include punctuation and spelling (for reasons indicated above). Probably I missed some 80 other differences, but 200 major differences in one whole play, based on a different original text, do show how close Mr. Wilson's text still is to Mr. Shaaber's. To compare, there were only about 41 such differences in Part I where the same original text was used by both editors.

Here again, though, it is the stage directions that really distinguish the two texts. Consider the 10 innovations Mr. Wilson used in *Henry IV,* Part I, as listed above.

(1) Drooping exits for direct statements is again very much in evidence.[46]

(2) So also is this one (revising of *enters* in the same way).[47]

(3) And this (for movements of actors) appears many times.[48]

(4) A few descriptive phrases are inserted.[49]

(5) *Asides,* or single parentheses to indicate them, are still present, but not overdone.[50]

(6) The Editor adds a few of these (new locale notes).[51]

(7) Mr. Wilson's use of other editors' stage directions in this text is very prominent, and he also adds to an editor's direction.[52]

(8) He still uses single quotes for an original Quarto stage direction, but not many appear in this text.[53]

(9) Again he quotes some editors' stage directions, without acknowledgment—in fact, more often than in Part I.[54]

This situation is made even worse by the fact that at least three times he does put quotes around an editor's s.d.[55]

(10) He is still adding something of his own to a Quarto s.d.[56] I shall now have to add three more innovations in this text:

(11) He often *almost* follows the F s.d.[57]

(12) A few times he adds a s.d. to indicate the 'addressee.'[58]

(13) But the most startling thing in the whole text is the vast number of brand-new stage directions, wherein he either drops the precise readings of both Q and F or makes

All in all, then, this Part II is an even more astonishing text, with regard to its stage directions, than was Part I. Yet the editor's discussion of his stage directions on p. 127 occupies only 4½ lines! Mr. Flatter[60] will probably be even more horrified by all this new "business."

In the midst of all this textual discussion I should like to insert the name of Capell. Mr. Wilson's use of this editor (or his imitators) is amazing—on p. 45 alone Capell's ideas appear three times[61] and on p. 46 twice;[62] and by a rough count Capell is used on 25 other pages of this text,[63] though Mr. Wilson refers to him directly only 7 times,[64] I think, in his Notes. Before I got through with this text, I decided that the old 18th-century editors were not so inconsequential after all, for Capell is not the only one Mr. Wilson

uses (Johnson, Malone and Pope also appear[65]). But Capell leads easily.

The Notes to this text, I should say—again without examining them for possible sources—are better than those in Part I. There are many explanatory notes[66] and also a few interpretive notes.[67] There are notes on speech headings,[68] notes on staging[69]—three times the editor explains his own stage direction[70] and once admits he 'lifted' one.[71] Twice he suggests an emendation he did not use in the text;[72] Holinshed appears many times again in preference to Mr. Tillyard's Hall;[73] and, sad to say, the old refrain—"hitherto unnoticed"[74]—crops up again here, a little more often than in Part I. But the most peculiar thing about these notes is their apparent haste of production, for Mr. Wilson has dashed off abbreviations of words persistently that at times are a bit confusing.[75]

Finally, these Notes prove again the new, great deference of Mr. Wilson toward other scholars—a point I emphasized at the very beginning of this paper. Added to 4 Englishmen and a German in the "Copy" section are some 14 Englishmen and 4 Germans in the Notes. And to the two Americans referred to under the "Copy" Mr. Wilson adds 6 more in the Notes, including even Mr. E. E. Stoll,[76] whom Mr. Wilson has often derided. In this text, Kittredge got only one reference, I think—compare 14 in Part I—whereas Mr. Shaaber led the field with 33 distinct references![77] Verily Mr. Wilson has become not merely deferential, but deferential even to Americans.

To conclude, I return to my sad tone at the end of *Henry IV*, Part I, above. Where is the old Wilson of *MAAN, MND, AYLI,* and *TN?* Are there no cuts, no mixtures of prose and verse, no textual strata, no signs of revision? Again I can note that the editor has definitely suggested cuts,[78] and has also pointed out F and Q mixups of prose and verse,[79] but there are several other spots where prose and verse are intermingled *within the same scene*.[80] *Was* Falstaff's part enlarged here? The Editor has discussed the mixup of two Bardolphs,[81] but not textual layers. As in Part I it is all a bit disappointing. The material for

speculations is all here, but the man who made them in earlier plays is no longer interested in them. Only twice does he burst forth in the old detective-like speculation,[82] and the first time he is following Greg and Pollard, but the second time—in the first note on the Epilogue—it is the old Wilson in action.

"Quo vadis" now, Mr. Wilson?

Wayne University, Detroit

---

[1]P. vii. [2]*Shakespeare's History Plays* (Macmillan, 1946), pp. 149, 238.
[3]P. xiii. [4]P. vii. [5]P. xvii. [6]Pp xxviin, 108n, 110, 113, 148, 174, 179.
[7]I, 1, 55-6; I, 1, 75-6; I, 1, 103-4; I, 3, 124; I, 3, 223-4; I, 3, 242. These lines always refer to the Dover Wilson text, unless otherwise indicated.
[8]II, 1, 75; II, 2, 42; II, 2, 50; II, 3, 2—this one Mr. Wilson himself failed to list on p. 107 though his note on p. 141 indicates it; II, 3, 80 ff.[II, 4, 32[II, 4, 177; II, 4, 242; II, 4, 482.
[9]III, 1, 98; III, 1, 105-9; III, 1, 232-5; III, 1, 247-9[III, 2, 156[III, 3, 72 and 75; III, 3, 156 (might be termed a modernized spelling, I suppose); III, 3, 188; III, 3, 195.
[10]IV, 1, 54-5; IV, 1, 97 and 98; IV, 1, 127; IV, 2, 3; IV, 2, 77-8; IV, 3, 13-4 and 16-7.
[11]V, 1, 121-2; V, 2, 3 (this is another rejection of a Q reading that Mr. Wilson failed to note on p. 107, though he did on p. 182)[V, 2, 27-8[V, 2, 94-5; V, 4, 1-2; V, 4, 61-2 and 158-9.
[12]I, 1, 6; etc., etc. (*Cf.* especially I, 2, 161-7.)
[13]*Cf.* III, 2, 122; etc., etc.
[14]See p. xlvii.
[15]Richard Flatter, "Modern Stage-Directions in Shakspere," Shakespeare Assoc. *Bulletin*, XXL (1946), 116-23. There is nothing new about this discovery of peculiar stage directions in the Dover Wilson texts: Dr. S. A. Tannenbaum pointed them out with regard to *The Tempest* way back in 1931 and in his pamphlet *The New Cambridge Shakspere and 'The Two Gentlemen of Verona'* (1939, pp. 18-27)—see *PQ*, X (1931), 102 ff. The point now is that they are getting *more* peculiar.
[16]This s.d. occurs specifically at I, 2, 153 ('Exit F' in F 2-4). But exactly the same change takes place on pp. 12, 13, 16, 24, 25, 28, 29 (twice), 33, 43, 50, 55, 59 (twice), 60, 65, 71, 76, 82, 84, 88, 90, 94, 96, 98, 100, 101, 102.
[17]Quarto has "Enter Worcester" at I, 3, 129. Wilson turns it around to "Worcester returns." He also does this consistently on pp. 9, 26, 27, 28, 29 (twice), 36, 42, 44, 67, 74, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 96, 97, 99.
[18]For instance at II, 4, 3: "[Comes forth]." This sort of thing also happens on pp. 26, 35, 37 (twice), 38, 42, 51, 52, 53, 58. "[Mortimer sits and she with him]," 88, 95.
[19]For instance I, 2, 106: "[points]" and II, 3, 73: "[rapt]." This also occurs on pp. 10, 13, 41, 42, 45.
[20]Pp. 24, 28, 40, 52, 94, 100.
[21]*Cf.* I, 2: "Sir John Falstaff lies snoring upon a bench in a corner. The Prince of Wales enters and rouses him." See also pp. 13, 26 (for II, 2), 34 (for II, 4) and 76 (for IV, 2).
[22]For instance p. 37: Q has only "Enter Falstaffe." Mr. Wilson inserts: "Falstaff enters with Gadshill, Bardolph and Peto; Francis follows with cups of sack." So far this is derived from Dyce. But Mr. Wilson adds, on his own: "Falstaff, taking no heed of Prince and Poins, sits wearily at a table." This happens also on pp. 39 (Johnson), 43 (White), 49 (several editors), 50 (Collier), 53 (Capell), 65 (several editors), 84 (Theobald), 88 (Theobald), 95 (Capell), 98 (Johnson), 99

(Malone). Other Capell ideas appear on pp. 32, 90 (V, 2, 28), and 99 (V, 4, 139).

[23]This happens very often. See, for instance, p. 23: [they whistle]; p. 30: 'Enter Hotspur, solus, reading a letter.' See also pp. 23, 29, 31, 36, 38, 48, 49, 50, 51, 57, 58, 59, 60, 72, 80, 84, 93, 94, 96, 98, 99, 100. On p. 96, however, he failed to quote the Quarto stage direction correctly.

[24]At the beginning of Act IV, Sc. 4, Mr. Wilson writes: "York. A Room in the Archbishop's Palace." These are Capell's precise words. The same thing happens at the beginning of V, i: "The King's Camp near Shrewsbury"—again Capell's exact words. He also used Collier's words, "dragging off the body," at the end of V, 4 (p. 100).

[25]For example p. 29 (II, 2, 101): ['They all run away, leaving the booty behind them, and Falstaff after a blow or two runs away too.' So far the Q. Then Mr. Wilson drops the last four words of the Q s.d. and adds, himself, "roaring for mercy as the Prince and Poins prick him from behind with their swords." There is no closing bracket. The same manoeuvre occurs on pp. 30, 57, 65, 68 (here Mr. Wilson interpolates words *within* the Q s.d.), 78, 84, 92, 95, 97.

[26]*Op. cit.*, p. 123.

[27]See *TLS*, Aug. 24, 1946 (by Janet Spens); Aug. 24, 1946 (in the review entitled "The True Prince"); Oct. 26, 1946 (by K. B. Danks).

[28]See pp. 146 and 188 (note to V, 4, 96). Miss Spens (*TLS*, Aug. 24, 1946) took him to task for that remark on p. 146.

[29]See pp. 115, 116, 117, 160, 163, 165, 166, 187.

[30]See notes to I, 2, 105-7; III, 1, 160-2 and 195; IV, 2, 23-4.

[31]P. 149: II, 4, 188-9.

[32]See Kittredge's Ginn text of *Hamlet*, I, 5, 167—pp. 172-3.

[33]Pp. 110, 113, 115, 117, 124, 125 (twice), 128, 137, 159, 163, 168, 174. 178.

[34]See p. 126 (note to I, 3, 1-4): "Perhaps an opening passage has been cut." He notes the mixture of prose and verse on p. 143 (note to II, 3, 79-90) and on p. 163 (note to III, 1, 251-6). "Note the sudden return to verse."

[35]See p. 160 (note to III, 1, 112): "A short line."

[36]See p. 166 (note to III, 2, 173-8): "Two textual strata seem discernible."

[37]See p. 183 (note to V, 2, 30): "The obscurity may be the result of revision"[and p. 185 (note to V, 3, 39-55): "This seems to me a clear example of verse prosified in revision."

[38]P. 126. Ten pages earlier he had written: "... the pointing of the F is practically our sole guide for a large proportion of the play."

[39]P. 116. [40]P. 117. [41]Pp. 119 ff.

[42]P. 119. See also pp. 129 and 148 in the Notes.

[43]Pp. 124, 136, 139, 144 (twice), 150, 157, 164, 166, 167, 174, 179, 181, 183, 186, 191, 195 (twice), 201 (twice), 202 (twice), 208 (twice), 211, 212, 215.

[44]P. 179.

[45]I could list these, as I did in Notes 7-11 above, but I don't think it is necessary. And I am quite willing to admit that I probably missed a few others. See my statement in the text below.

[46]*Cf.* p. 21 at the end of I, 2: "he limps off"—where Q has nothing and F has *Exeunt*. This also happens on pp. 6, 13, 25, 31, 36, 37, 40, 51, 52, 55, 64, 65, 72, 73, 77, 79, 81, 103, 113. There is only *one* exception—on p. 90.

[47]For example, p. 6: "Northumberland comes forth" ...—near the beginning of I, 1—where Q has "Enter the Earle Northumberland" and F has "Enter Northumberland." See also pp. 7, 9, 15, 16, 41, 63, 66, 77, 85, etc.

[48]*Cf.* p. 16: "[bows]"[and pp. 34, 35, 52, 58, 83, 89, 105, 108, 111.

[49]For instance p. 59: "[a gaunt man]." And see pp. 60 (twice), 61. There are also sounds indicated—*i.e.* p. 25: "[roars]"; and pp. 40: "[faintly]"; 45: "[shouts]"; 51: "[sobs]"; 52: "[sobs]"; 104: "[he hiccoughs]."

[50]For *asides*: pp. 19, 47, 60; for single parentheses: pp. 18, 27, 48, 49, 63.

[51]For instance p. 25 at the start of II, 1: Eastcheap is Rowe's idea, but Mr. Wilson has added: "Near the Boar's Head Tavern." See also pp. 31 ("A Room in the Prince's House"), 39 (the locale direction at the beginning of II, 4 is a mixup of Malone and Mr. Wilson), 52 ("The Palace at Westminster" is a combination of Theobald and Dyce, but "past midnight" is Mr. Wilson), 66 ("Gaultree Forest, Yorkshire" is merely the Cambridge reading reversed).

[52]This idea has already been indicated in Note 51. There are many times when Mr. Wilson follows an earlier editor in inserting a s.d.: *i.e.* p. 36: "[Bardolph and the Page go" for Capell's "Exit Page and Bardolph." See also pp. 42, 44 (at line 154), 45 (twice), 46 (21 words for Capell's 4), 47 (top one), 49, 50, 52 (first two), 75 (twice), 76 (three times), 77 (at bottom), 78 (first one), 86, 88 (three times), 92, 95 (top one), 97 (thre times), 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108 (line 136), 111. Occasionally, as in Note 51, Mr. Wilson not only changes the words of the Editor but adds something of his own. See, for example, p. 46 at the top: "[Bardolph seizes Pistol and forces him back towards the door on the right." So far it is Rowe's general idea, except at the end. Mr. Wilson adds: "Falstaff follows behind." See also p. 103 (at start of V, 3), 106 (at line 82), 111 (at line 42—this one in a combination of Q with single quotes, Capell and Dover Wilson, who added, "come from the Abbey").

[53]See pp. 5, 6, 27, 100, 109, 110, 111, etc.

[54]P. 14 ("A Street in London" is Pope); 26 ("and a scuffle ensues" is Capell and on p. 146 Mr. Wilson admits it); 34 ("gives him money" is Pope); 37 ("Enter... Percy" is all Rowe); 43 ("filling and reaching out to him" are Capell's precise words); 55 ("Before . . . Gloucestershire" is Malone); 82 ("Westminster . . . Chamber" is the Cambridge edition); 87 (ditto); 98 (both s.d. at the start of V,2, are Capell's except for one word); 104 ("seating . . . table" are Malone's words).

[55]See p. 33 (single quotes for Rowe), 52 (for Capell) and 57 (for Capell).

[56]This can be followed by noting the single quotes, plus something extra, on pp. 14, 78, 111. The same thing actually happens, *without quotes*, on pp. 31 (Enter... Wales). On p. 150 Mr. Wilson explains his own addition to this s.d.

[57]See p. 21 ("Enter... Bardolph"), 47 ("Enter... Drawers"), 94 ("Enter... others"). On p. 58 "Enter Falstaff" is really directly quoted from a F s.d.

[58]See p. 30: "[to Gower]"; 31 (ditto); 41: "[to Doll]"; 51: "[to the Page]"; 54: "[to Warwick]"; etc. Others on this type are taken from Editors—e.g. "[aside to Bardolph]" on p. 31, from Malone.

[59]*Cf.* p. 6: "[A Porter appears on the wall above the gate]"; 15: "[whips . . . him," owing something perhaps to Capell and Irving; 20 (at bottom); 25: "Yeoman Snare . . . up"; 27: "[She strikes . . . Falstaff"; 29 (last one); 40 (top one); 46 (last one); 62 (last one); 64: "[Wart . . . action]"; 89: "[he kneels . . . pause"; 96 (top one); 104 (top one); 113: "[they arrest . . . party".

For new wording in s.d. which depend on Q and F see pp. 6 (bottom), 15: "The Lord . . . servant"; 26 (first one); 31: "Enter . . . Wales"; 51 (last one); 67, 78, 82 (at top), 105 (top one); 110 (top); etc.

[60]*SAB*, XXI (1946), 116-23.

[61]After lines 179 and 192 and for the lining of lines 191-3.

[62]After lines 204 and 208 for the stage directions.

[63]On pp. 15 (s.d. at line 55), 21 (first s.d.), 26 (quoted in last s.d.), 36 (last s.d.), 42 (last s.d.), 43 (quoted s.d. at line 108), 44 (s.d. at line 154), 48 (s.d. at line 261—for kissing idea—to which Mr. Wilson adds 10 words), 50 (s.d.), 51 (first 2 s.d.), 52 (quoted in s.d.), 57 (quoted in s.d.), 59 (for *an't* reading in line 109 and elsewhere), 63 (for reading *I'll* in line 240), 73 (for s.d. beginning IV,2), 76 (for first three s.d.), 87 (for first s.d.), 88 (for first and third s.d.), 89 (for third s.d.), 98 (quoted in s.d. opening V,2), 103 (in 2 s.d. beginning V,3), 104 (for s.d. at line 16), 111 (for part of s.d. at line 41).

[64]On pp. 127, 131, 146, 156, 186, 194, 211.

[65]Johnson, pp. 134, 144, 201, 204, etc. Malone p. 200, and see notes 54 and 58 above. Pope, pp. 131, 204, 214, and see note 54 above. See also Rowe above.

[66]See Notes on Induction, line 5; II, 1, 24; II, 2, 99; II, 2, 166-7—this one is commented on in the *TLS*, Sept. 21, and Oct. 12, 1946; II, 4, 47-50; II, 4, 151-3; III, 1, 12; III, 2,31 (here Mr. Wilson is "showing off" a bit?); III, 2, 281-4; etc., etc.

[67]See notes on I, 1, 153-60 (on Pope and Shakspere); I, 2, 1 (on actor); I, 2, 202; II, 1, 1-6 (on actors); II, 2, 62; II, 4, 151-2; II, 4, 155-7; III, 1, 17; III, 2, 132-5 (this one sounded like 'Kitty' in action); V, 1, 78; V, 5, 98-100.

[68]See notes on I, 1, 34-6; I, 1, 161-2; I, 2, 118; I, 3, 109; etc., etc.

[69]See notes on II, 4, 175 and on s.d. of IV, 1, and of IV, 5. Anc cf. note 67 above on actors.

[70]See pp. 146, 150, 204. [71]P. 146. [72]See pp. 143 and 167.

[73]See pp. 142, 143, 170, 202. On p. 171 (note to III, 1, 80-5) and on p. 187 (note to IV, 2, 123) he gets very close to Mr. Tillyard's ideas.

[74]Especially on pp. 180 (III, 2, 329-31), and 187 (IV, 3, 8-9). See also pp. 143 (I, 3, 36-7), 157 (II, 4, 18), and 209 (headnote to V, 5).

[75]See p. 136 (I, 2, 47): "Poss" for *possibly;* "Sh." for Shakspere (it could be Shaaber?). P. 142 headnote: "Hol." for *Holinshed;* "acc." for according; "app." for *apparently.* P. 143 (I, 3, 36-7): "wh." for *which;* also on p. 173. P. 172 (III, 2, 9): "Qu" for *Queen.* P. 176 (III, 2, 189-90): "Prob." for *Probably;* P. 188 (IV, 3, 41): "Ju." for *Julius.* This one note of four lines contains 4 abbreviations. P. 214 (Epoligue): "wh. . . . edd . . . par" . . etc.

[76]P. 168.

[77]Four times in the "Copy" section and 29 times in the Notes. See note 43 above. Did Mr. Shaaber miss the lining problem at V, 3, 110 and V, 4, 28 (Dover Wilson text)? And did he get confused about *most* and *best* in V, 5, 23?

[78]P. 132 (I, 1, 189-90): "A palpable cut"; and p. 182 (IV, 1, 60-1): "Something is prob. [*sic*] lost between these two lines."

[79]See pp. 189 (IV, 3, 79-81), 195 (IV, 5, 51-2), 207 (V, 3, 118-22), and 213 (V, 5, 95-6). Mr. Wilson misses those at V, 1, 16 and 50-53?

[80]See pp. 27, 79, 80 (twice), 112.

[81]P. 125.

[82]Pp. 122-3 and 214.

"THE FOOT OF MOTION"

By Ruth L. Anderson

Donalbain (*aside to Malcolm*)
Our tears are not yet brew'd.
Malcolm (*aside to Donalbain*)
Nor our strong sorrow
Upon the foot of motion.

(Macbeth, II, iii, 130-131.)

IN the "Clarendon" edition of *Macbeth,* "strong sorrow" is annotated, "Sorrow in its first strength is motionless and cannot express itself in words or tears." This comment Professor Cuningham repeats in the "Arden" edition of the play and for comparison directs attention to the lines,

The grief that does not speak
Whispers the o'erfraught heart and bids it break.—
(IV, iii, 209-210)

The "Yale" text gives "ready for action" as explanation of "upon the foot of motion' '.In his recent edition of the play, Professor Adams offers a similar suggestion: "Ready to put itself into motion."

Interpretations suggested here are contrary, I think, to Elizabethan theories of emotion and to the content of the passages from which the lines quoted above are taken. According to Elizabethan thinking sorrow in its "first strength" (see below) need not and does not express itself in words or tears, because it is within the bounds of nature. Only as it creates physical distress does emotion seek expression. The lines quoted by Professor Cuningham for comparison refer obviously to an intense emotion, one which, as the result of repeated wrongs done against Scotland and finally against Macduff, has grown to such an extent that it must either find relief or destroy the substance of the heart. The speech of Donalbain implies that greater grief is in store for the sons of the murdered Duncan—their tears are "not yet brew'd"; fate may at any time "rush from an auger hole" and seize them. The first words of Malcolm are in agreement with this thought but they

emphasize the inward aspect of grief rather than its expression in teams—"our strong sorrow" is not yet brewed.

What, then, is the meaning of the words, "upon the foot of motion"? Is there anything in the conversation between the sons to justify the annotation, "ready for action," or to indicate that, as Professor Adams implies, the sorrow of the sons is "ready to put itself into motion"? On the contrary, it seems, there has been up to this point a moment of hesitancy "Why do we hold our tongues?"—during which the sons have arrived at one conclusion: their lives are in danger; their safest immediate course is to flee. But flight is never prompted by grief; grief either blunts the heart or enrages it. The only action which follows springs from a fear which leads reason to sense danger and "avoid the aim." Malcolm's speech should be associated not with our word "action" but with an Elizabethan use of the word "motion."

Writers contemporary with Shakspere frequently define "motion" as a first movement of "appetite"; that is, as a first awakening of an "affection." According to Nemesius (*The Nature of Man,* London, 1636) "motion" is a response of the soul which remains agreeable to nature, whereas an "unseasonable motion" is an "affection" or "passion." In discussing love, La Primaudaye (*The French Academie,* London, 1618) says that as soon as a good is propounded to man it is "well liked of"; that is, it evokes a response. He continues: "And this liking or delight is, as it were, a little pleasant winde of motion in the heart which beginneth to rise and follow after this good." When the liking grows strong it becomes love, one of the primary affections. Here again "motion" signifies an early affective state.

In the light of this reasoning, the words of Malcolm seem to mean that the sudden grief of the sons is but a mild disturbance of the soul in comparison with the tremendous grief that will come from further crime. Following the course of all crescent emotion, as additional murders occur in Scotland, "strong sorrow" will develop in the path of,

or on the base of, their first grief; that is, "upon the foot of motion."[1] The speech of Malcolm is but a continuation of the thought suggested by Donalbain that the future will bring greater cause for tears, a thought stressed again by the sons at the moment of their flight. The two passages are complementary. Donalbain speaks of grief in terms of its expression; Malcolm, in terms of its inward accompanying state. Both imply that the sorrow just begun will increase.[2]

[1] *Cf. Henry IV*, V, v, 20: Seeing all his men "upon the foot of fear," Douglas fled from the battlefield.

[2] A similar distinction between an emotion as an inward state of the soul and its accompanying physical distress expressing itself in signs appears in *Titus Andronicus*, III, i, 217-218:

> Is not my sorrow deep, having no bottom?
> Then be my passions bottomless with them.

Terms descriptive of emotion and a few other uses of them in Shakspere are discussed in my monograph, *Elizabethan Psychology and Shakespeare's Plays*, pp. 68-71.

SOME SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURY SATIRE AGAINST MONEY LENDERS (Concluded)

By Burton A. Milligan

2. *Satire Against Brokers*

Brokers, or pawnbrokers, were frequently attacked by Tudor and Stuart satirists, mainly because brokers, too, were associated with various types of usury. Like the satire already considered, much of the satire against brokers was general, assuming that public contempt for brokers was so great that no bill of particulars against them was needed. For example, John Taylor, in *The Sculler's Travels* (1612), refers to

> The base extorting black sould bribing Broaker,
> The Bane of Mankind and his Countries choaker.[54]

The broker is "a slave that lives by fraud," says Taylor elsewhere.[55] Stubbes, in *The Second Part of the Anatomy of Abuses,* castigates "this dunghill trade of brokerie, newly sprung up, and coined in the devil's minting house."[56] To Greene, "this base churle" is

> one of the moaths of the commonwealth, hee is the spoile of young

> gentlemen, a bloud sucker of the poore, as thrifty as a horse leach that will never leave driiking while hee burst.[57]

"There is no faith in man," says Pietro, in Marston and Webster's *The Malcontent* (*c.* 1600). "In none but usurers and brokers," replies Malevole; "they deceive no man: men take 'em for bloodsuckers, and so they are."[58] In Marston's *The Scourge of Villainy* (1598) the satire is even more bitter:

> A die, a drab, and filthy broking knaves
> Are the world's wide mouths, all-devouring graves.[59]

Few descriptions of the broker are as good natured as John Day's in *The Parliament of Bees* (1641). Day calls him a "moath" who

> takes up all petticoats he meets,
> Eats Feather-beds, Boulsters, Pillows, Blanquets, Sheets,
> And with sale bills lays Shirts and smocks abed
> In linen, close adulterie; and, instead
> Of cloaths, strows Lavender so strongly on 'em
> The owners never more can smell upon 'em.[60]

Lupton puns on the word *broker*: "*Broke Currs* they are in two respects, most of them were broke before they set vp, and Currs for biting so sore euer since they set vp."[61]

The knavery of brokers was in the strictest sense proverbial. John Heywood, in *Three Hundred Epigrams upon three hundred proverbes* (1562), said:

> Two false knaves need no broker: but it is neede
> That brokers breake false knaves felowshyp with speede.[62]

"It hath been used as a common byword," said Greene, "a craftie Knave needeth no Broker, whereby it should appeare that there can hardlie be a craftier knave then a Broker."[63] John Davies, like Heywood, made a new epigram turn on an old proverb. In "Upon English Proverbes" (*c.* 1611) he wrote:

> A false knave needs no brokers: but a broker
> Needs a false knave (a hangman or a hooker).[64]

The conventional charges against brokers were: receiving and selling stolen goods, giving loans representing only a fraction of the value of the goods pawned, and exacting forfeits remorselessly on the day loans came due.

The accusation that brokers bought and sold stolen goods and were in league with thieves was made repeatedly. Some of the satirists considered that brokers were morally responsible for the crimes of shoplifters and other thieves, if not actually the instigators of the crimes. The broker, wrote Stubbes,

> hath made many a thief more than ever would have bin, & hath brought many a one to a shameful end at Tiburne & elsewhere. Yea, I have herd prisoners (and not any almost but they sing the same song) when they have gone to execution, declaime & crie out against brookers. For, said they, 'if brokers had not bin, we had not come to this shamefull death; if they would not have received our stollen goods, we woulde never have stollen them; and if we had not stollen them, we had not bin hanged.'[65]

Greene considered brokers "a kind of idle sort of lewd livers, as pernitious as the lift [shoplifter] for they receive at their hands whatsoever Garbage [stolen goods] is convaied."[66] "Were not bad brokers," wrote Greene in another place, "there would be lesse filching and fewer thieves."[67] Dekker declared that "all brokers would make their Wils at Tiborne if the searching for stolne goods which they have Received, should like a plague but once come amongst them."[68] *Four for a Peny: or Poor Robin's Character of an Unconscionable Pawnbroker* (1678) asserted that the broker "is the treasurer of the thieves' exchequer, the common fender of all bulkers [low-lived persons; rascals] and shoplifts in town."[69] "The best bargains he buys," said Samuel Butler, "are from thieves and housebreakers, with which he turns Merchant adventurer by sea and land."[70] In the drama, one finds Frippery, in Middleton's *Your Five Gallants* (1608), exemplifying the broker who received stolen goods.

The niggardliness of the loans advanced by brokers on pawned goods and their general policy of extortion came in for severe satire. Greene charged that a broker would

not advance more than three pounds on a pawn worth at least ten.[71] The author of the broadside ballad "I Would You Never Had Said So" (1618) wrote sarcastically:

> The broker in the Hundred takes,
> good man, but Foure score:
> His Conscience is so upright,
> he will not ask for more.[72]

Impotens, in Day's *The Parliament of Bees* (1641), tells a sorrowful story of how he was fleeced by a broker to whom he pawned his weapons:

> I pawned my weapons, to buy course brown bread
> Too feed my fry and me. Being forfeited,
> Twice so much money as he lent I gave,
> To have mine armes againe.[73]

Four for a Peny asserted with vehemence that the broker's trade "outvies usury as much as incest simple fornication"![74] A lamentable ballad, "The Poor People's Complaint of Brokers" (*c.* 1680), charged brokers with allowing loans equal to only half the value of pawned goods:

> But woe to the man that in their hands fall;
> 20 shillings-worth of work he must leave for ten
> And extortion must pay e're he hath it agen:
> Oh! are not these a sort of unconscionable men?[75]

"A New Merry Ballad I Have Here" (1629) roundly attacks the rapacity of brokers:

> The Broker, his [the Usurer's] brother,
> is as bad or worse:
> If they but a little
> money disburse:
> Theyl sucke out your marrow,
> Your heart's blood also;
> Their dangerous Vipers,
> I tell you but so.[76]

Greene, in *A Quippe for an Upstart Courtier* (1592), testifies to the brokers' merciless seizure of goods on which loans were not promptly paid:

> Beside, they extort upon the poore that are inforced through

> extreame want to pawn their cloathes and householde stuffe, their pewter and brasse, and if the poor souls that labour hard misse but a day, the base broker takes the forfeit without remorse or pity.[77]

George Wither's *The Scourge* (1617) attacks the same abuse. The whipping Satyr is commanded to

> Desire the Brokers that they would not yawne
> After the forfeit of another's pawne.
> It is their right by Law they'l say, 'tis true;
> And so's their soule, perhaps, another's due:
> But sting them; if their conscience quite be fled,
> Then shall they pay, what they have forfeited.[78]

In its broad particulars the conventionalized portraiture of the broker has already been indicated, but a minor particular or two remain to be considered. One of the conventionalized details of description was the assertion that the broker secured from the hangman many of the clothes displayed in his shop. For instance, in F. D.'s "New Medley" (*c.* 1620) this assertion is made:

> The Broker hath gay clothes to sell
> Which from the Hangman's budget fell.[79]

Another typical reference is that in John Taylor's *A Brood of Cormorants,* in which it is said that the Broker

> Hangs up the hangman's wardrop at his doore
> Which by the hangman hath been hang'd before.[80]

Similarly, Lupton wrote: "They [brokers] are beholden to the Hang-man, for he furnishes their shops."[81] The references to hangmen's clothes in brokers' shops were no doubt figurative rather than literal. The joke suggests the shabby and disreputable appearance of the goods in the brokers' shops and demeans the broker by associating him with the ever-unpopular hangman. In this connection one might remind oneself of lines from Shakspere's *The First Part of Henry the Fourth* which illustrate the currency of the joke about the hangman's wardrobe. Falstaff says, "Do not thou, when thou art king, hang a thief."

Prince. No; thou shalt.

Fal. Shall I? O rare! By the Lord, I'll be a brave judge.

Prince. Thou judgest false already: I mean thou shalt have the hanging of the thieves and so become a rare hangman.

Fal. Well, Hal, well; and in some sort it jumps with my humour as well as waiting in the court, I can tell you.

Prince. For obtaining of suits?

Fal. Yea, for obtaining of suits, whereof the hangman hath no lean wardrobe.[82]

In view of the popular hatred of brokers manifest in broadside ballads, characters, and plays, it might be suspected that they would have been the objects of legal restrictions and prosecutions. The suspicion is unjustified, however, except in so far as laws against usury were, or were meant to be, a restriction against abuses by brokers. There was also, it appears, some effort, ineffectively carried out, to limit the number of brokers in London; for Hake complained, in 1579, that there were "hundreds" of brokers in the city, undisturbed by the magistrates, whereas it had once been ordained that their number should not exceed thirty.[83] In at least two sermons, preachers condemned brokers as bitterly as the satirists condemned them. Henry Smith (1560-1591) devoted considerable space in the first of his two sermons on "The Examination of Usury" to his contention that pawnbrokers were no better than usurers.[84] In a sermon preached in 1612, Thomas Adams described the extortion of brokers as "monstrous" and called brokers "the very vermine of the earth."[85] In 1601, the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London addressed a letter to Sir Edward Coke, Queen Elizabeth's Attorney-General, asking support of "a bill preferred to the Parliament for the reformation of abuses practized by brokers in and about this Cittie."[86] It seems clear again that literary satire was topical and mainly accurate, in spite of its humor, invective, and exaggeration.

3. *Satire Against Goldsmiths*

Goldsmiths enjoyed a generally good reputation for honesty. In fact, the infrequency of satirical attacks on them makes it easy to understand why the hallmark of the Goldsmiths' Company became a guarantee of excellence. Never-

theless, there were occasional charges of dishonesty even against craftsmen enjoying the high repute that goldsmiths had. Among these comparatively isolated attacks on goldsmiths was the charge that goldsmiths dealt in usury.

Greene, in *A Quippe for an Upstart Courtier* (1592), made the charge that goldsmiths dealt in usury.[87] The charge has some significance, because Greene sought for, and exposed, roguery in high places as well as low and seems to have been mainly reliable. Moreover, William Chaffers, in his history of English goldsmiths, gives credence to Green's indictment:

> The old goldsmiths and bankers advanced money upon pledges as pawnbrokers do now, choosing of course the most valuable articles as security. In the early ledgers of Alderman Backwell and Blanchard and Child's accounts may be seen a separate heading of *Pawnes,* to which all interest and profits arising from 'money' lent' on pledges, or more marketable security, was placed.[88]

It would be strange indeed had not goldsmiths, who undeniably dealt in money lending, been associated with some of the abuses of money lending. Without further evidence, however, it would be dangerous indeed to assume that most goldsmiths were guilty of usury.

4. *Satire against Grain Hoarders and Speculators*

Nashe, in *Christs Teares over Jerusalem* (1593), was by no means alone in coupling "Usurers and Engrossers of Corne" and in accusing them of "hoording up of gold and graine tyll it is mouldy, rusty, Moath-eaten, and almost infects the ayre with the stincke."[89] As early as 1509, Barclay wrote, in *The Ship of Fools,* speaking of grain hoarders and speculators:

> These wretched folys of mynde ar made so dull
> That with theyr money gotten all by fals usury
> Of corne and vytale they stuff thyre houses full
> Thereby to ingender nede, and paynfull penury
> Unto the pore, that they may wyn therby.
> So of all vytayle these wretches get plentye
> To sell it derer, whan some great darth shalbe.[90]

That grain hoarders and speculators were linked with

usurers is not strange. Both were in a sense hoarders; both were speculators; both made money engender money; both were merciless to the poor and the needy.[91]

* * *

As one reviews the volume of satire against usurers and those accused of usury, one understands better not only the hatred of usury and the reasons for this hatred, but also the genesis of the usurer as a somewhat conventionalized literary type.

University of Illinois

---

[1]Traill, H. D., *Social England,* 6 vols. (New York, 1895), III, 130.

[2]See *Psalms,* xv, 1 and 5; *Deut.* xxiii, 19-20; *Exod.,* xxii, 25; *Lev.,* xxv, 36.

[3]Usury, wrote Aristotle, *Politics and Economics,* translated by Edward Walford (London, 1900), p. 25, "has not its origin in nature, but amongst ourselves; for usury is most reasonably detested, as the increase of our fortune arises from the money itself, and not by employing it to the purpose for which it was intended. For it was devised for the sake of exchange, but usury multiplies it . . . and usury is merely money born of money; so that of all means of money-making this is the most contrary to nature."

[4]Rowlands, in "The Letting of Humours Blood in the Head-Vaine," *Complete Works,* 3 vols. (Glasgow, 1880), I, 53, wrote:

> Then that most pretious mettal doth engender:
> Begetting daylie more and more encrease.

Middleton, *Works,* ed. A. H. Bullen, 8 vols. (London, 1886), VIII, 18, referred to principal and interest as "money and the breed of it—for interest may well be called the usurer's bastard." Dekker, referring to a certain usurer in *A Knights Conjuring,* reprinted in *Percy Society Publications,* V, 56, said that "he could make one hundred pound be great with child and be delivered with another in a very short time; his money (like pigeons) laid every month." John Davies' "Of Usurers," *Works,* ed. Alexander B. Grosart (Edinburgh, 1878), II, 21, compares the productiveness of usurers' money to the productiveness of hares. Orlando, in Dekker's *The Honest Whore, Part II,* II, i, says, denying that he is a usurer: "No, no, no, sir, no! I cannot abide to have money engender: fie upon this silver lechery, fie."

[5]I, iii, 92-97.

[6]Traill, *Social England,* III, 131.

[7]*Acts of the Privy Council of England,* ed. J. R. Dasent, 32 vols. (London, 1890-1907), XXXI, 379.

[8]Traill, III, 543. Two earlier acts against usury, in 1552 and 1571 (5 and 6 Edward VI, c. 20; 13 Elizabeth, c. 83, failed to lower the ten per cent maximum legal rate of interest established in the act of 1536. These two acts are reprinted in full in Tawney and Power, *Tudor Economic Documents,* 3 vols. (London, 1924), II, 142-143, 160-163.

[9]*Juvenilia,* 2 vols. (Spenser Society, 1871), I, 165-165.

[10]*Essays,* ed. W. Aldis Wright (New York, 1926), p. 168.

[11]*Sermons,* ed. Edward Arber (London, 1871), p. 44.

[12]*The Sermons of Edwin Sandys,* ed. John Ayre (Cambridge University Press, 1842), p. 50.

[13]Smith, *Works,* ed. Thomas Fuller, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1866), I, 88 ff.

[14]*The White Devil, or the Hypocrite Uncased* (London, 1613), p. 51.

[15]*Ibid.,* pp. 53-63.

[16]*Mystical Bedlam, The World of Mad-men* (London, 1615), pp. 58-59.
[17]*Anatomy of Abuses,* ed. F. J. Furnivall, New Shakspere Society, Series 6, VI, 123.
[18]*Works,* ed. Ronald B. McKerrow, 5 vols. (London, 1910), II, 158.
[19]*The Blacke Bookes Messenger,* ed. G. B. Harrison (New York, 1924), p. 14.
[20]*The Works of John Taylor: Reprinted from the Folio of 1630* (Spenser Society, 1868), p. 511.
[21]*Ibid.,* p. 254.
[22]*A Strappado for the Divell,* ed. J. B. Ebsworth (Boston, Lincolnshire, 1878), pp. 28-29.
[23]*The Pepys Ballads,* ed. H. E. Rollins, 6 vols. (Harvard University Press, 1929-1941), II, 119.
[24]See Apperson, *English Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases* (New York, 1929) under "Usurer."
[25]Act II, Scene ii.
[26]"The viii and last Satyr," *Newes out of Powles Churchyarde,* ed. Charles Edmonds (London, 1872).
[27]IV, iii, 4-5. The extent of Master Rash's loss may be gauged by the fact that a mark was 13s, 4d. For a valuable comment on this passage and on the use of commodities generally, see I. D'Israeli, *Curiosities of Literature,* 3 vols. (Boston, 1834), III, 96.
[28]II, iii.
[29]I, i.
[30]*The Complete Poems of Joseph Hall,* ed. Alexander B. Grosart (Manchester, 1879), pp. 122-127.
[31]*Skialetheia,* ed. Grosart (Manchester, 1878), p. 10.
[32]*Works: Reprinted from the Folio of 1630,* p. 489.
[33]*The Seven Deadly Sinnes of London,* ed. H. F. B. Brett-Smith (Oxford, 1922), p. 48.
[34]*Shakespeare Jest-Books,* ed. W. C. Hazlitt, 3 vols. (London, 1864), III, 18.
[35]II, ii; III, i.
[36]II, ii.
[37]II, i.
[38]V, vii.
[39]Cf. Nashe's description, *Works,* ed. McKerrow, I, 162-163, of the dirty, ragged, and repulsive usurer encountered by Pierce Penilesse at Westminster.
[40]*The Good and the Bad,* reprinted in *Archaica,* ed. E. Brydges, 2 vols. (London, 1815), I, 25.
[41]*Works,* I, 53.
[42]*Budge* is a fur prepared from lambskin.
[43]Rowlands, *op. cit.,* I, 53.
[44]*The Old Book Collector's Miscellany,* ed. C. Hindley, 3 vols. (London, 1871-1873), III, 1-7. This pamphlet is a dialogue between a nurse and a maid employed by a usurer. A good share of it consists of the usurer's buying a pullet for his sick wife, deciding to save the feathers and take them home under his hat, and losing the feathers when he has to raise his hat to the Lord Mayor.
[45]*Epigrams and Satyres* (Edinburgh, 1840), pp. 23-24.
[46]Middleton, *Works,* ed. A. H. Bullen, 8 vols. (London, 1886), VIII, 17.
[47]Marston, *Works,* ed. A. H. Bullen, 3 vols. (London, 1887), III, 328.
[48]*Works,* I, 13.
[49]*Works,* ed. Bullen, VIII, 28.
[50]III, ii, 9-10.
[51]V, vi, 72-85.
[52]II, ii.
[53]*Dramatic Works of Richard Brome,* 3 vols. (London, 1873), III, 284.
[54]*The Works of John Taylor* (Manchester, 1868), p. 511.
[55]See Taylor's laudatory verses to Thomas Heywood prefacing *An Apology for Actors* (London, Shakespeare Society, 1841), p. 12.
[56]*The Second Part of the Anatomy of Abuses,* ed. F. J. Furnivall, New Shakspere Society, Series 6, XII, 39.
[57]*Works,* ed. Grosart, XI, 243.
[58]IV, iv.

[59]*Works,* ed. Bullen, III, 318.
[60]*Works of John Day,* ed. A. H. Bullen, 2 vols. (London, 1881), I, 63.
[61]*London and the Countrey Carbonadoed* (Edinburgh, 1884), p. 73.
[62]*Proverbs and Epigrams of John Heywood* (London, Spenser Society, 1867), p. 135.
[63]*Second Part of Conny-catching,* ed. G. B. Harrison (New York, 1923), p. 49.
[64]*Complete Works of John Davies of Hereford,* ed. Alexander B. Grosart, 2 vols. (Edinburgh University Press, 1878), II, 43. The reference to hangmen takes its meaning from the fact that the clothing of executed prisoners belonged to hangmen and could be disposed of by them. Hookers were sneak thieves, equipped with long hooks, who stole clothing out of bedroom windows and, presumably, sold it to brokers. See my article, "Spenser's Malengin and the Rogue-Book Hooker," *Philological Quarterly,* Vol. XIX, No. 2 (April, 1940), pp. 147-148.
[65]*The Second Part of the Anatomy of Abuses,* ed. Furnivall, New Shakspere Society, Series 6, XII, 39.
[66]*The Second Part of Conny-catching,* ed. Harrison, p. 47.
[67]*Works,* ed. Grosart, XI, 245.
[68]Harleian Miscellany, 10 vols. (London, 1808-1813), VIII, 179.
[70]*Characters and Passages from Note-Books,* ed. A. R. Waller (Cambridge University Press, 1908), p. 202.
[71]*Works,* ed. Grosart, XI, 243.
[72]*Pepys Ballads,* ed. Rollins, I, 125.
[73]*Works,* ed. Bullen, I, 64.
[74]*Harleian Miscellany,* VIII, 179.
[75]*Pepys Ballads,* III, 88.
[76]*Pepys Ballads,* II, 120.
[77]*Works,* ed. Grosart, XI, 245.
[78]*Juvenilia,* 2 vols. (Manchester, Spenser Society, 1871), II, 338.
[79]*The Roxburghe Ballads,* ed. William Chappell and J. W. Ebsworth, 9 vols. (London, 1871), I, 61.
[80]*Works of John Taylor: Reprinted from Folio of 1630,* p. 489.
[81]*London and the Countrey Carbonadoed,* p. 73.
[82]I, ii, 69-82.
[83]"The Seauenth Satyr," *Newes out of Powles Churchyarde,* ed. Charles Edmonds (London, 1872).
[84]*Works of Henry Smith,* ed. Thomas Fuller, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1866), I, 94-95.
[85]*The White Devil, or The Hypocrite Uncased* (London, 1613), p. 50.
[86]This letter is reprinted by Frank Aydelotte, *Elizabethan Rogues and Vagabonds* (Clarendon Press, 1913), p. 164, from *Remembrancia,* ii, 213 (fo, 63 verso).
[87]*Works,* ed. Grosart, XI, 277.
[88]*Gilda Aurifabrorum: A History of English Goldsmiths and Plateworkers* ,London, 1899), p. 77.
[89]*Works,* ed. McKerrow, II, 158, Cf. Overbury, *Miscellaneous Works in Prose and Verse,* ed. E. F. Rimbault (London, 1856), p. 132.
[90]*The Ship of Fools,* ed. T. H. Jamieson, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1874), II, 167.
[91]For further details about conventionalized satire against grain speculators, see Celeste Turner Wright, "Some Conventions Regarding the Usurer in Elizabethan Literature," *Studies in Philology,* XXXI (1934), 195, and my own article, "16th- and 17th-Century Satire Against Grain Engrossers," *Studies in Philology,* XXXVII (1940), 585-597.

FRENCH TRANSLATION OF A PASSAGE IN *LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST*

The prayful Princesse pearst and prickt a prettie pleasing Pricket.
Some say a Sore, but not a sore, till now made sore with shooting.
The Dogges did yell, put ell to Sore, then Sorell iumps from thicket:
Or Pricket-sore, or else Sorell, the people fall a hooting.
If Sore be sore, then ell to Sore, makes fiftie sores O sorell:
Of one sore I an hundred make by adding but one more L.

Various translations of this whimsical and complicated "Epytaph on the death of the Deare" by the preposterous Holophernes are collected in the Furness Variorum Edition (1904), pp. 382-84. There seems to be no adequate French translation. I have essayed one, following the schemes of metre and rhyme, with alliterations ('affecting the letter') and wordplays. As Holophernes must use technical and archaic terms of the chase, strange to the average reader, a brief glossary is in order. If this deserves the rebuke that it is in bad taste as the dissection of a joke, the apology is that the whole epitaph is an ingenious masterpiece of bad taste, in keeping with the character of the speaker.

bois (sg.), A deer's antlers; also a wood.

daguer, v., line 1, To 'pierce'n/ a beast of the chase with a *dague,* A pointed weapon; also the first pricke or horn of a young deer or pricket; *daguer,* line 4, To strike with the horns (said of a deer); also Se coupler avec la daine (idem).

daguet = *dagard* (dim.), A pricket or deer of the first head.

damage, old form of dommage.—Line 2, daim agé dagué = damagé daguet.

elle, line 5, = L; L = elle.

faon, (rhymes with *paon, quand,* etc.) A fawn;— *faonet* = *faonel,* diminutives of faon.—*faonner,* v., To give birth to a fawn.—Line 5, faonet et faon) = faonné .—faonel = faon - L.

huage (the h—is aspirated), The yell (Shaks. = L) of the retainers when the quarry is at bay (aux abois).

meute, A pack of hounds.

L'Épitaphe sur la Mort du Daim.

La demoiselle dague et darde un doulx daim au beau bois.
Pas daguet, mais daim agé dagué, Madame, o damage!
La meute aboie; et dans le bois le daim est aux abois.
Ou daim, daguet, ou bien dagard, il dague. On fait huage.
Sa daine faonne; elle, et faon, faonet, font faonel. Or L
Fait cinquante faons. J'en fais cent si j'ajoute encor L.

JOHN PHELPS

Baltimore

NOTE—For Elizabethan puns on 'pierce' and other wordplays in *Love's Labour's Lost* see the author's 'Father Parsons in Shakespeare,' Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen, etc. (Berlin, 1914), Vol. 133, pp. 66 ff.; also W. R. Dunstan, Times Literary Supplement. Oct. 30th, 1943, p. 523.